

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

ROSALIO REYNOSO ARELLANO,

Defendant.

CASE NO. 2:22-cr-00151-LK

ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO  
SEAL


This matter comes before the Court on the Government’s unopposed motion to seal Exhibit A of its sentencing memorandum. Dkt. No. 282. The Government states that Exhibit A (Linesheets) contain “the contents of judicially authorized interception of wire and oral communications,” including communications from individuals who have not been charged in this matter, and 18 U.S.C. § 2517 “requires that these wiretap interceptions be sealed and remain so except under narrowly defined circumstances, including while giving testimony under oath.” *Id.* at 1–2; *see also* Dkt. No. 283 (sealed Exhibit A).

1 “Historically, courts have recognized a ‘general right to inspect and copy public records  
2 and documents, including judicial records and documents.’” *Kamakana v. City & Cnty. of*  
3 *Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178 (9th Cir. 2006) (quoting *Nixon v. Warner Commc’ns, Inc.*, 435  
4 U.S. 589, 597 & n.7 (1978)). However, Section 2517 limits when information collected from  
5 wiretapping may be disclosed. Courts in the Ninth Circuit have interpreted the statutory provisions  
6 as “prohibiting the public disclosure of [wiretapping] material until after it has been admitted into  
7 evidence in a criminal trial or at a suppression hearing.” *United States v. Rand*, No. 3:16-cr-00029-  
8 MMD-WGC, 2016 WL 6208265, at \*3 (D. Nev. Oct. 24, 2016); *see also United States v. Kwok*  
9 *Cheung Chow*, No. 14-cr-00196-CRB (JCS), 2015 WL 5094744, at \*3 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 28, 2015)  
10 (“Courts have generally held that in light of Title III’s purpose of safeguarding privacy, the  
11 statute’s list of permissible disclosures is exclusive—in other words, ‘what is not permitted [under  
12 § 2517] is forbidden.’” (quoting *United States v. Dorfman*, 690 F.2d 1230, 1234 (7th Cir. 1982))).

13 The Court has reviewed the document at issue, which comprises the contents of judicially-  
14 authorized interceptions of wire and oral communications, including communications with  
15 individuals who have not been charged in this matter. Dkt. No. 283. Redaction is not a feasible  
16 alternative to sealing. The Court finds that the document may remain under seal pursuant to 18  
17 U.S.C. § 2517. *See Kwok Cheung Chow*, 2015 WL 5094744, at \*7.

18 The Court therefore GRANTS the motion to seal. Dkt. No. 282. Exhibit A may remain  
19 under seal. Dkt. No. 283.

20 Dated this 3rd day of March, 2025.

21 

22 Lauren King  
23 United States District Judge  
24